

REMARKS

Applicant gratefully acknowledges Examiner Casca and SPE Harper for courtesies extended during the personal interview dated September 28, 2010, including Applicant's representatives Ms. Imura, Sean McGinn, and Frederick Cooperrider.

During this interview Applicant's representatives explained the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references, including the distinction that independent claim 1 requires that there be more than one criterion (i.e., "criteria" is the plural form of "criterion") and that the information sent to the information collection server includes at least both of location information and reception status information.

The present invention provides a mechanism in which any of a plurality of conditions related to maintenance or degraded performance is sent automatically to a server collecting this type of data, so that adjustments such as antenna tilt or power levels can be made within the coverage area. In some embodiments, the information collection server can also transmit a trigger so that a plurality of users simultaneously acquire and transmit location/reception status information. In some embodiments, time information is also sent.

Thus, as explained in lines 3-6 on page 5 of the specification, the present invention is also directed to the problem recognized by the present inventor that the conventional user-terminal reporting mechanism such as that described in JP-2002-152104 fails to recognize causes of changes in the reception status. Accordingly, by responding to a plurality of criterion and preset trigger conditions and by reporting a plurality of parameters, the present invention is capable of permitting development of more than one type of service map related to maintenance and optimization of service in the coverage area.

During the interview, Examiner Casca indicated his concern about the meaning of several terms in the independent claims. As agreed to by Applicants' representatives, this supplemental amendment is intended to attempt to respond to these concerns. However, it is noted that various existing dependent claims already would seem to address some of these concerns, by providing specific examples of conditions that trigger automatic reporting to the information collecting server. Additionally, it is noted that dependent claims 56, 62, 68, and 72 provide additional clarification of terms that seem to address some of these concerns.

SPE Harper indicated that he considered that the cited reference impliedly sends a second parameter by its ability to automatically send a report upon having returned into the

service area after having been disconnected, after having detected that its received signal strength permitted a reconnection to the system.

In response and upon further reflection, Applicant submits that such automatic reconnection to the communication by the disconnected user terminal would not satisfy the plain meaning of the language of the independent claims, since the reconnected user terminal is not sending any received signal strength information as data to the information collection server, as clearly required by the independent claims. Therefore, even if there is an implicit detection of received signal strength in the method described by Veerasamy, this reference still fails to report this received signal strength data to the information collection server as data related to developing a service mapping of the coverage area.

Claims 1-7, 20-26, 39-45, 49-57, 62, 63, 68, 69, and 72-89 are all the claims presently pending in the application. Claims 8-19, 27-38, 46-48, 58-61, 64-67, 70, and 71 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 82-89 are added.

In view of the comments and concerns raised during the above-mentioned personal interview, Applicant has amended several claims. Applicant believes that all arguments presented in the Amendment Under 37 CFR §1.111, filed on September 13, 2010, remain valid in view of the discussions in this interview and the concerns raised by the Examiners. Therefore, these previously-presented arguments are not repeated in this Supplemental Amendment.

Moreover, Applicant believes that neither the Veerasamy nor Ma reference reasonably demonstrates the various configurations shown in Figures 3, 5, and 7, that selectively include a reception status acquisition unit, a position information acquisition unit, a time information acquisition unit, a communication status acquisition unit, and a trigger information reception unit. Various claim amendments and new claims attempt to provide more precise definitions of these various types of units within the user terminals, as well as present additional aspects of the invention.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-7, 20-26, 39-45, 49-57, 62, 63, 68, 69, and 72-89, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are allowable, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Such action would be appreciated.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary for allowance in a telephonic or personal interview.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR §1.136. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiency in fees, including extension of time fees, or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,



Date: November 3, 2010

Frederick E. Cooperrider
Registration No. 36,769

Sean M. McGinn, Esq.
Registration No. 34,386

McGinn Intellectual Property Law Group, PLLC
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, VA 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254